

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,930	02/27/2004	David Martyn Roessler	GP-302457	9546
75	590 03/30/2006		EXAM	INER
KATHRYN A MARRA			LEE, GUNYOUNG T	
General Motors Corporation Mail Code 482-C23-B21, Legal Staff			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 300			2875	
Detroit, MI 48265-3000			DATE MAILED, 02/20/2007	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Н
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/788,930	ROESSLER, DAVID MARTYN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gunyoung T. Lee	2875
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a inceptly within the statutory minimum of thir riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Af	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{0}$	<u>1/23/2006</u> .	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 11-17 is/are pending in the application	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>11-17</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	na/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examinei. Note the attache	d Office Action of form F10-102.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	•	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage
application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a		received
See the attached detailed Office action for a	i not of the contined copies for	
Attachment(s)	🗖	. (070 440)
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) L Interview	Summary (PTO-413)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/23/2006.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930 Page 2

Art Unit: 2875

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Response to Amendment

- 1. Applicant's amendment filed on January 23, 2006 has been entered:
  - Claims 11 and 14-15 have been amended;
  - Claims 1-10 and 18-20 have been cancelled;
  - Claims 11-17 are still pending in this application, with claim 11 being independent.

### Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments regarding newly amended claims 11-17 filed on January 23, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.
- 3. In response to applicant's argument regarding newly amended claims 11-17 that "there is no disclosure or suggestion of **applying** the article or molding to a vehicle roof assembly" (Remarks, pages 4-5), the phrase "**vehicle roof**" is recited in the **preamble** of claim 11. It is clearly addressed in the MPEP that a preamble is not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure (see MPEP § 2111). Further, it is implicitly disclosed in Benavides (US 5,053,930) cited in the Office Action dated on October 18, 2005 that the phosphorescent illuminating device of Benavides is used on a vehicle roof (sunroof), as described below.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930

Art Unit: 2875

- 4. In response to applicant's argument regarding newly amended claims 11-17 that "Benavides (*prior art*) does not teach or suggest a roof assembly" (Remarks, pages 5-7), it is clearly addressed in the MPEP that the motivation for **modifying** the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention does not need to come from the reference itself (see MPEP § 2143 § 2143.03). Benavides discloses that the phosphorescent illuminating device is used as a vehicle interior item (col. 6, lines 59-61) placed on/near a light conducting part of the vehicle, such as a sunroof or rear and side windows (col. 4, lines 38-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the phosphorescent illuminating device of Benavides on/near the sunroof of a vehicle, for the purpose of increasing the safety of the driver by providing easily locatable switches (e.g. sunroof control switches) in darkness, as well as providing pleasure to the driver and passenger (especially children) with various shapes of glowing parts placed near/on the sunroof wall.
- In response to applicant's argument regarding newly amended claims 11-17 that "the present claims are directed to a self illuminating roof assembly that illuminates interior of a vehicle, not merely a system to enhance visibility of an accessory" (Remarks, page 6), Benavides clearly discloses that the phosphorescent illuminating device (could be an accessory) enhances the visibility by self illuminating (glowing) (abstract, lines 1-5). Therefore, the self-illuminating (glowing) accessory is inherently illuminating the interior of a vehicle while it is glowing. Further, it has been held that "apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard

Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

### Claim Objections

- 6. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: (a) there are **more than one** transitional phrases "comprises" and "comprising" in line 2 (see MPEP §

  2111.03); and (b) the phrase "the foregoing phosphors" in line 3 renders the claim indefinite, because it is not clearly whether the phrase refers to all three groups "non-oxide phosphor, oxide phosphor or combination of both" or one of them. Appropriate correction is required.
- 7. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informality: the phrase "the zinc sulfide doped with a transition being configured to provide a glow light discharge with a particular hue" in lines 3-4 of claim 15 is not a proper format a member of Markush Group (see MPEP § 2173.05). Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

## (Regarding claims 14-15, as best understood)

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930 Page 5

Art Unit: 2875

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 9. The claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. See MPEP § 2111.
- 10. Claims 11-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benavides (US 5,053,930) in view of Britt et al. (US 4,401,050).
- 11. Benavides was a phosphorescent illuminating device for a vehicle interior (col. 6, lines 50-61).
- 12. In regards to claims 11-17, Benavides discloses;
  - An interior panel having a phosphorescent material and a polymer matrix (col. 6, lines 50-51) (claim 11);
  - Wherein the phosphorescent material is dispersed within the polymer matrix (col.
    6, lines 50-51) (claim 12);
  - A light-conducting component (Fig. 1, 30, 38) disposed between a location
    external to the vehicle (20) and a point adjacent to the interior panel to transmit
    external light to the interior panel (col. 4, lines 38-41) (claim 16);
  - Wherein the light-conducting component (Fig. 1, 30, 28) includes an existing window of the vehicle (20) (claim 17).
- 13. However, Benavides dose not expressly but implicitly discloses:
  - A roof wall having an exterior surface (claim 11).

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930 Page 6

Art Unit: 2875

Benavides discloses that the top of a vehicle (Fig. 1, 20) is constructed with a roof wall (sunroof) obviously having an exterior surface and an interior surface and conducting light into the vehicle. Benavides further discloses that the phosphorescent illuminating device is placed on/near a light conducting part of the vehicle, such as a sunroof or rear and side windows (col. 4, lines 38-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the phosphorescent illuminating device of Benavides on the roof wall (sunroof), for the purpose of increasing the safety of the driver by providing easily locatable switches (e.g. sunroof control switches) in darkness, as well as providing pleasure to the driver and passenger (especially children) with various shapes of glowing parts placed near/on the sunroof wall.

- 14. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benavides (US 5,053,930) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Britt et al. (US 4,401,050).
- 15. In regards to claims 13-15, Benavides discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for:
  - Wherein the phosphorescent material is disposed on at least one surface of the polymer matrix (claim 13);
  - Wherein the phosphorescent material being configured to from a pattern on or in the polymer matrix (claim 14);

Art Unit: 2875

 Wherein the phosphorescent material includes a non-oxide phosphor, an oxide phosphor, or a combination of both (claim 14);

- Wherein the non-oxide phosphor is selected from a group consisting of zinc sulfide, zinc sulfide doped with a transition metal, and zinc sulfide dope with a rare earth metal (claim 15).
- 16. In regards to a phosphorescent material disposed on at least one surface of the polymer matrix (claim 13) with a pattern (claim 14), Britt et al. disclose a phosphorescent lighting device (Fig. 2) having a phosphorescent material (16) disposed on at least one surface (22) of the polymer matrix (12) with a pattern (Fig. 1).

  Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the phosphorescent material as shown in Britt et al. for the phosphorescent illuminating device of Benavides, for the purpose of providing a protection on the phosphorescent material by placing under the polymer layer, and enhancing the pleasure to the passenger by providing self-illuminating parts in various shapes.
- 17. In regards to the phosphorescent material as one of a non-oxide phosphor, an oxide phosphor, or a combination of both (claim 14), wherein the non-oxide phosphor is one of zinc sulfide, zinc sulfide doped with a transition metal, and zinc sulfide doped with an earth metal (claim 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose the phosphorescent material within a non-

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930

Art Unit: 2875

oxide phosphor, an oxide phosphor, or a combination of both, since it is well known and generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art as phosphorescent materials.

Further, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of the suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

#### Conclusion

18. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gunyoung T. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-8588. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:30 - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra L. O'Shea can be reached at (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/788,930

Art Unit: 2875

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GTL 3/22/2006

> JOHN ANTHONY WARD PRIMARY EXAMINER